

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

U. S. Department of Agriculture
Office of the Secretary

Several weeks ago one of the weekly newsletters published by a charter member of the Washington association of political pundits carried a run-down of speculation as to those who might be potential members of the next Cabinet. Opposite the post of Secretary of Agriculture was the phrase, "Who wants it?"

I suppose that looking at the job in one way, it might be good for a few minutes on "Laugh-In"; most Secretaries of Agriculture, in the public mind, are more to be censured than pitied. It is a job that requires an infinite capacity for rolling with the punches.

In an urban society, people tend to view any Secretary of Agriculture as not relevant, as an anachronism. Few realize that the Secretary and his Department have a national constituency -- every individual in the country. And that the Secretary and his Department have the responsibility -- among many responsibilities -- to insure a completely adequate supply of food for the American people, and to meet our foreign commitments.

This responsibility extends further than just the assurance this food is clean, wholesome and available in the grocery store; this responsibility extends to seeing to it this food gets to the pantry shelf for low-income families and to the plates of children in school and in other activities -- with special emphasis on reaching children in low-income areas.

I have talked and I have warned for years now that in large measure many of the problems confronting the cities are the product of

Address by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman at the opening of the Falls Church High School Student Council's Christmas Food drive, Falls Church, Virginia, at 2 p.m. (EST) Wednesday, December 11, 1968.

the agricultural revolution. Few listened until recently -- few saw the relationship between the rural uprooting and the building crisis of urban unrest. Poverty in education, poverty in job-skills were not discovered in the ghetto; they moved as the rural residents moved to the city. These people were not escaping poverty. Most of them -- if not all -- brought their problems with them in an effort to survive.

How have we acted to meet this problem? How has suburbia, the citadel of middle class affluence, the power base of democracy in Mid-century, reacted?

The drive you are conducting to collect food is an admirable symbol of offering what you have in abundance. Although I know Mayor Washington will accept your offering gracefully on behalf of those who need help, do not be surprised if some groups express resentment. Respect is more in demand than charity -- opportunity is more acceptable than a hand-out. To some in the urban areas your symbolic gesture will reinforce what they were sure they knew all along -- the affluent suburbs regard the city as one vast ghetto of trouble and poverty. A nice place to visit during the daylight hours -- a pleasant place to work as long as you can head back across the river barrier come evening.

Others will say that Christmas baskets are fine, but what about New Year's and the Fourth of July and Labor Day, and every other day in the week?

Good food is a day-in-day-out need.

That is why we have worked so hard over these past eight years to develop delivery systems that will assure food on the table day-in and day-out.

That is why I am announcing today some changes in the Food Stamp Program. You are the first to hear about it. As soon as we can get the changes made in all the States, we are going to see to it that families with net incomes of under \$70 a month get more food for less cash, under the Food Stamp Program.

Last year we moved to reduce the purchase requirement for the poorest of the poor to 50 cents a person per month with a maximum payment of \$3.00 for a family of six or more. This will remain the same but these families will receive more coupons.

For example, a family of four with a monthly income of \$20 in Virginia, now pays \$2.00 and gets \$48.00 worth of food stamps. After the program changes, they will pay \$2.00 and get \$58.00 worth of food stamps.

A family of four with a monthly income of \$50.00 in Virginia now pays \$22.00 for \$58.00 worth of stamps. In the future, they will be paying only \$18.00 for \$60.00 worth of stamps.

I would like to do more since much more needs doing; I wish we could do more, but we are doing all that we can with what the American people have given us.

We did just recently add another 235 areas to the Food Stamp Program. When we get all of these into operation, we will have well over 3 million people in 43 States and the District of Columbia participating in the Food Stamp Program. Added to these are another 3.5 million low-income people who are receiving donated foods under the Direct Distribution Program.

This means that at a time of unparalleled prosperity, we have over 6 million people participating in food assistance programs for families. And bear in mind that almost 40 percent of these are people who are not on welfare -- although they have welfare level incomes but who aren't eligible for welfare because they don't fit into one of the categories. The only help they get is through the USDA.

Who are they? Some are the elderly living on limited pensions -- others are working part time, and others are fully employed but at wages that deny a fair standard of living.

It takes time and money and a continuing battle for both authority and money to see to it that people really have full access to a good diet. We haven't arrived yet, but we are in much better shape than we were even several years ago.

I want to outline for you a few of the things we have been able to accomplish -- I have announced these steps as they were taken, but announcements by the Secretary of Agriculture have a tendency to be carried on that page of the newspaper that follows the last page.

* * * We have increased the variety of foods from the five offered under the commodity donation program in 1960 to 22 foods -- enriched and selected to meet almost completely the full dietary allowances recommended by the National Research Council.

* * * We have one or the other family food assistance programs operating in areas where more than 85 percent of our population lives. I pledged some months back that one or the other of these programs would be in operation in the 1,000 lowest income counties in the country.

At that time, we were in all but about 330 of these counties. This has now been done. We are helping to pay the local costs in 186 counties and are actually operating the donation program in 49 counties where the local governments refused to do so even with our financial help.

There are still about 480 counties where no food program is available or planned, including some 50 counties and independent cities in Virginia. I intend to begin steps to assure the families who need food assistance in these areas will be served before another year passes.

* * * We are distributing a special supplementary food package to new and expectant mothers and to infants and young children in low-income areas. These supplementary foods include evaporated milk and corn syrup for formula making, iron-enriched baby cereal and fortified fruit juices. These foods are being distributed through health centers and clinics virtually as though they were part of a medical prescription.

* * * Looking back, we have made equally dramatic progress in improving the delivery systems for reaching children and young people, although each step was a struggle. But we fought for and got:

1. In 1962 an amendment to the National School Lunch Act to authorize a higher rate of payment per meal to schools that enrolled children of low-income families. We did not get any money for this until the 1965-66 school year and then only a very limited amount that did not go very far when spread nation-wide.

2. In 1964, the Child Nutrition Act that authorized a pilot School Breakfast Program and assistance to low-income area schools for the purchase of food service equipment. Again, the legislation was enacted but the appropriation was miniscule.

3. In 1968, the Vanik bill that extended food service assistance to children in groups outside the school -- children in day-care centers, settlement houses, neighborhood houses and summer day camps. The Vanik bill also extended the Breakfast Program for another three years. We opened the first of the day care center food projects a few weeks ago in Gary, Indiana, and more are opening each week.

4. In 1968, we made a real break-through in funding for the food programs for needy children. For the first time we are in a position to really move out and reach hundreds of thousands of additional children in urban elementary schools and remote rural schools.

We were very much aware that all too many schools -- especially those in urban areas and in more remote rural areas -- could not afford a lunch program. These were schools that had no food service facilities, and no money to buy them. These were schools where children could afford only a token payment at best. These were schools where the children most needed both a lunch and breakfast program.

This was a deep and galling irony. Suburban schools were springing up all over the country with well equipped kitchens and cafeterias, and the young people were participating in the lunch program by the millions.

Yet the school lunch program was a ready-made tool -- a real mechanism for getting a good nutritious meal to a youngster -- a way of

assuring at least one-third to one-half of his daily nutritional needs however little his parents might know about what that child should have to eat at home.

We explained to the Congress over and over again that we had no intention of trying to duplicate those suburban facilities in every inner-city elementary school in the country. We knew, because some cities had tried it, that a few extra pieces of equipment in a junior or senior high would make it possible for them to serve a group of satellite schools. We knew there were new ways, new techniques for preparing and serving food.

And we are beginning to really move. For more than a year we've had a real drive going under Operation Metropolitan to get meals to youngsters in the downtown areas.

We are now putting together a complete model food package in five Model Cities in cooperation with the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. We want to show what can be done with an all-out effort. We want to make it as convenient as possible for low-income families in these model neighborhoods to participate fully in a food assistance program whether it be the donation program or the Food Stamp Program. We need to reach out and explain the importance of good nutrition to these families -- young and old. We want both a breakfast or a lunch program in every school in these model neighborhoods.

You can help us. Every man, woman and child in this country can help us. You can't deliver a food basket every day, but you can help us with your support for these programs, and your efforts to reach those who need what these programs can provide.

You now have a Food Stamp Program in Fairfax County. There has been one in the District of Columbia for several years. We in the Department of Agriculture cannot alone begin to get the word out as to its availability, and the importance of using it.

We have to rely on the community to do the job. We have to rely on church groups and civic organizations and interested individuals and local officials to show some concern for their own -- for example, to organize carpools to get the elderly or the disabled to and from the food stamp issuance office or the commodity distribution center, or to serve as proxies for the elderly or disabled. We have to rely on you to take a look at your lunch and breakfast programs to see that the needy children have a chance for a decent diet.

We need people to help on nutrition education drives in their communities. We have materials that set forth the nutrition story in the simplest possible terms -- we have leaflets and movies and we have slide series. We can't do this job by ourselves.

As I mentioned earlier, we still have a long way to go. We should bring a family food assistance program to every home that needs it, and we should apply a single standard of need whether Virginia is involved or New York, or California. We want to make still more adjustments in the food stamp program so that no family will have to

pay more than 25 percent of its income and still receive enough food stamps for a fully adequate diet. This will require several billion dollars and the pre-condition to achieving this goal is public support. We should have a meal for every needy child in every school or wherever that child can be reached, and reached year-round.

We have cared long and deeply, 365 and 366 days of the year for eight years about the challenge of hunger and malnutrition.

It has been a lonely vigil, and our critics have been harsh. It will continue to be a lonely struggle so long as the American people assume that a basket of food at Christmas is an adequate response.

I hope that you consider the food you gather for the poor this Christmas as the beginning -- and not the conclusion -- of your commitment to end hunger in America.

If it is the beginning, then there is hope that your generation will have the capacity to carry out the vision which my generation only now has grasped.

U. S. DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE
NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY

JAN 17 1969

CURRENT SERIAL RECORDS

Office of the Secretary of Agriculture

I come here tonight after more than eight years in Washington to make a kind of valedictory speech -- to tell the home folks whom I love so much, and especially my associates in the ASCS of Minnesota, what I have been trying to do these last eight challenging, exacting, sometimes frustrating and disappointing, but always rewarding years.

When it was rumored in November of 1960 that President-elect John F. Kennedy might ask Orville Freeman to join his Cabinet as Secretary of Agriculture, many of my friends advised me against it. They said that I was foolish to even consider it, that -- as they put it -- "No one could win" in that impossible job.

Well, I don't know if I have "won" or not and that isn't important. But, speaking from my heart, I can tell you tonight as I prepare to lay aside my responsibilities after eight years, I feel richly rewarded.

Rewarded not because we have reached all our goals, but because we have never stopped trying, and we have marched a good way on the road to each of those goals.

-- Rewarded because farm income is up and surpluses are gone, and workable programs for the future are in place.

Address by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman at the annual Minnesota State ASCS Conference Banquet, St. Paul Hilton Hotel, St. Paul, Minnesota, 8:00 PM (CST), Thursday, January 9, 1969.

-- Rewarded because millions of people, young and old, eat better with Food Stamp and Child Nutrition programs that didn't exist eight years ago.

-- Rewarded because a rural renaissance is under way in this country and the USDA has sparked it. Today three times more Federal Government credit is available in Town and Country America to finance new housing, water and sewer systems, recreation and conservation projects, and off-farm income has zoomed.

-- Rewarded because a tropical agricultural revolution is under way in many of the less-developed countries and prospects for winning the War on Hunger are infinitely better than they were eight years ago.

-- Rewarded because twice as many Americans are enjoying outdoor recreation and the Nation is increasingly and militantly conservation conscious.

-- Rewarded because the USDA is an even greater institution with a dynamic awareness of its task, with high morale, and thrust and direction and purpose, and justifiable pride in itself.

-- And finally, rewarded, and grateful, because of the friends I have made and hold so dear, not only in the United States, but all over the world.

(more)

You of the Minnesota ASCS have been very good to me -- responsive to my sometimes galloping demands, willing to work nights and Sundays and holidays. Without fail, you have been responsive and professional. Thank you for your many, many personal kindnesses to me and my family.

Permit me now to examine with you in some detail where we were in 1961, where we are today, and where and how we shall go from here.

It is true that we have had our disappointments over the years. Some of the programs that we advocated failed of passage in Congress or proved unacceptable to farmers. The defeat in Congress of the feed grain program proposed in 1962 was an example.

Another was the certificate wheat program that failed to get two-thirds approval in the 1963 referendum. Still another was the failure of the marketing order farmer bargaining power idea to find the acceptance and success that we hoped for in the early years of this Administration.

Still, in retrospect, these disappointments seem rather minor, in comparison with those actions and those programs which succeeded. Moreover, those disappointments were a part of the necessary process of hammering out acceptable policies within the democratic process. We had to find out what would work and what wouldn't -- what would be acceptable and what wouldn't.

(more)

So, as I look back, I really don't feel serious regret at those individual disappointments, bitter though they seemed at the time. They were a part of the development process. Certainly we can take satisfaction from the fact that we had the courage to reach out and discover the limits to which we might go. It can never be said that we were circumscribed by our own timidity.

Someone viewing Michelangelo's great statue of David observed that the magnificent David was contained in that block of marble for millions of years. But the freeing of David from the stone awaited the chisel of Michelangelo. Any work of art -- any achievement -- involves the chipping away of those elements that don't contribute to the final success. Sometimes, when you are close to it, you are not sure what is art and what is chip. But you chisel away, and you spend no lasting regrets on those ideas and those efforts that fall into the chip pile.

So my disappointments are little ones, and my rewards come from the over-all progress that has been made. In these eight years, we have gathered together our resources, planned new courses of action, and launched a major offensive to reach our goals. While we haven't gone as far as I wanted to go, we have moved on each of these goals a significant way down the road.

I think it is fair to say that the progress of the past eight years has led agriculture into a new era. Farmers and rural people are at a point where they can begin to share more fully in the continued economic growth and progress of America.

(more)

Net farm income in 1968 will turn out to be about \$15 billion. This is up 28 percent since the beginning of this decade. Net income per farm is up 65 percent, from \$2,962 to about \$4,875, during this time. The income gap between farmers and non-farmers has been cut in half. Farm exports are up 40 percent. Off farm income has climbed sharply.

Farm production is at an all-time high -- but the major surpluses have been eliminated. The inventory of commodities owned by the Government has dropped from over six billion dollars to less than one billion dollars -- the lowest in two decades.

The difference is that in the 1950's rising output was accompanied by rising surpluses. In the 1960's rising output has been accompanied by disappearing surpluses.

The "balanced abundance" that we have in America is no small achievement. It is no accident. It will continue to require the wisest exercise of public policy that our Government can bring to it.

American farmers still have the capacity to produce more than the market can absorb at a fair price to them. Economic forecasts indicate that some 50 to 60 million acres will need to be diverted from crop production during the foreseeable future.

(more)

The challenge is to achieve this diversion by programs satisfactory to farmers and sufficiently economical to be acceptable to non-farm people. To accomplish these things, we will continue to need price support programs linked to a supply-demand balance through production restraint.

This, very simply, is the crux of the matter. Whatever we do to improve distribution and to feed hungry people at home and abroad -- and this is of course crucial -- we will continue to need production restraint. This is not a philosophical or ideological argument; it is simply a pragmatic position. The capacity is there -- sufficient to overrun everything. And farmers must have the means to join together in restraining their own capacity for disaster.

The present voluntary programs, in my judgment, are working and workable -- particularly when combined with improved farmer bargaining power and greater use of the present authority for longer-term acreage adjustment.

(1) These programs are effective in assuring the abundance and wide variety of high quality foods that modern Americans are accustomed to -- at fair prices.

(2) They are successful in holding the pendulum of production within a tolerable range of fluctuation -- and holding prices for cooperators at decent levels, when supplemented by fair payments.

(more)

(3) They accomplish these things by voluntary means that conform to the well-established determination of American farmers to avoid coercion and maintain a maximum of individual management flexibility, and free play in our private commodity markets.

(4) With all this, the cost of the programs is relatively modest when measured against our growing national product and the diminishing percentage of over-all Government expenditures that is going to agriculture.

I do feel that greater use could be made of the Cropland Adjustment Program. As you know, Congress has funded that program in only two of the years since its enactment in 1965. The authority was just a few weeks old at the time of the first signup, in 1966. The second signup, in 1967, was restricted by Congress to a low level. The result is that CAP has never had a good chance to work. Although not funded for 1968 or 1969, the CAP authority is in effect through 1970.

The Cropland Adjustment Program was designed as an economical supplement to the annual programs, and our inability to use it more effectively has been a real disadvantage, particularly with the release of several million acres of old Conservation Reserve acreage that might have been put under CAP.

An advantage of the CAP authority is that it homes in on surplus-production allotment and base acreage and thus directly relieves a part of the cost of annual programs. Also, in this way, it avoids a massive retirement of whole farms, and thus is a distinct advantage to rural communities rather than an economic calamity as was the Soil Bank of the 1950's.

(more)

Today there appears to be renewed interest in a massive land retirement program that would be directed at whole farms and land other than base acreage producing crops in surplus. This is the program of a major farm organization, and it is one that received serious consideration in a recent study of the Economic Adjustment Center at Iowa State University. I hope that the dangers of indiscriminate whole-farm retirement and the cost of indiscriminate land retirement will be carefully considered.

I believe it is fair to ask whether the whole-farm retirement idea isn't really a mask for no program at all. Certainly, the so-called massive land-retirement idea emanates from the same people who have always espoused a "no program" position. And in view of the failure of the Soil Bank to meet the income and adjustment needs of the 1950's, we are entitled to look with some jaundice on a proposal that exclusive dependence be placed on such a program in the future.

Really -- when you boil it all down -- the only clear alternative to our current programs would be to adopt mandatory commodity programs on a bushel, pound, and bale basis. In terms of cost, in terms of workability, this is the clearest and simplest alternative.

Before you jump down my throat, I hasten to say that I know very well the political difficulties in doing this. In fact, nobody knows those difficulties better than Orville Freeman, for he lost several tough fights to put them into effect in the early 1960's.

(more)

But the fact is that, if those who criticize the present programs really want an alternative that will work, this is it -- mandatory programs. And unless we are willing and able to go to mandatory programs, there is little profit in discussing other alternatives that are really "half programs" or no programs at all. Because we still have the inescapable fact that we must have effective programs as long as agriculture retains the basic ability to overproduce use by vast amounts.

No serious student really argues with this. Any number of studies have been made -- some of them by groups of a rather conservative coloring -- yet none of them takes issue with this basic fact. There must be farm programs as long as there is overcapacity.

For eight years now, we have tried to communicate to non-farm people the basic economic justice of farm programs. We have tried to communicate the magnificent accomplishment of American agriculture -- as the well-spring of abundance and food security for a great Nation. And I think it is fair to say that the position of farmers in the public mind -- the understanding of farmers' needs and problems -- is much superior to what it was eight years ago.

I believe that America's consumers have an improved appreciation of what our agricultural success means to them -- in abundance, variety, quality and price. After all, it is something new in the world, and rare, that a people can take for granted an unfailing abundance of food, with the percent of income they spend to eat the lowest in the world and falling each year.

(more)

We -- and I mean all of agriculture -- must continue to remind the American public of these blessings. Increasingly, the average American has no ties to the land -- no memory and no direct knowledge of agriculture. Increasingly, the Congress is a citified place.

So -- unless we who are concerned about agriculture can somehow communicate this concern to Congress and the city people who increasingly will elect that Congress -- the consequences could be serious.

We could see a time when urban pressures for funds and programs and land would become so overpowering that the Nation's most basic resource, its ability to feed itself abundantly, might be lost in the confusion.

We might, in so doing, invite ourselves into a depression -- farm led and farm fed as they all have been and as all too few of our city friends understand.

You know and I know that a sound agriculture is basic to a sound economy and now I want to talk for a few minutes about another important factor in maintaining a strong farm economy -- exports, the overseas market. We have gone after that market hard, and in three ways.

First, by fighting hard to keep world markets open and limit the wave of protectionism; second, by aggressive trade promotion and strong selling efforts; and third, by helping less-developed countries to build a sound agricultural base from which to develop their own economies so over the long haul they can become good customers.

(more)

Our market development programs are financed by a combination of Public Law 480 and private funds. We have joined with more than 60 private trade groups in sales promotion campaigns in some 70 countries. We have been getting good results.

We have raised farm exports by about 30 percent since Fiscal Year 1961 -- from \$4.9 billion then to \$6.3 billion in Fiscal '68. And it is important to note that during this same period commercial sales -- sales for dollars -- have increased by 41 percent and now account for more than 75 percent of our total agricultural exports.

These exports have been over \$6 billion for five consecutive years. The produce of one in every four acres harvested on American farms now moves overseas.

While exports provide about one dollar in every six dollars of farm income, don't forget that other people besides farmers benefit directly from this large volume of foreign trade. Exports provide jobs for about 1 million non-farm people -- in processing, transportation, and firms servicing the American farmer.

Our farm sales abroad have been the one bright spot in our balance of payments picture, contributing a favorable balance of nearly \$1 billion per year during four of the past five years.

(more)

Those are some of the immediate gains from an aggressive policy of opening, expanding and maintaining foreign markets, but, as I said, we are moving on another front in agricultural exports, a front that offers market possibilities far beyond what we have today, and, in the long term, offers the best hope for lasting peace on this earth.

I am referring to the less-developed countries of the world, lands holding 2 billion potential customers for American food and fiber -- if they could afford to buy it.

We have greatly increased our efforts to help these countries develop a sound, progressive agriculture in the past 8 years. We have done so not only for the humanitarian reason of helping them to feed themselves, but for the very practical reason that economic development rests on agriculture.

No Nation can develop industrially when the bulk of its work force must spend its time and energy in subsistence farming in order to survive.

We have found that as countries become more efficient in food production, their overall economies grow and the per capita incomes of their people rise. Then they are able to buy more and better food.

The implications of this for American agriculture are considerable. A recent USDA study showed that a sharp rise occurs in the purchase of U. S. farm products when the per capita income of a country's people rises.

(more)

It showed, for example, that countries having a per capita income of less than \$200 a year buy commercially an average of only about 30 cents worth of U. S. farm products per person per year. But countries that have a per capita income of more than \$600 per year buy nearly \$8 worth of U. S. farm products per person.

That means that when per capita income was tripled, it resulted in an increase of almost 25 times in the purchase of U. S. farm products.

To date, seven developing countries, under the impact of our help and through their own efforts, have shifted from being primarily recipients of agricultural aid to cash customers for our agricultural products. They are Israel, Greece, Spain, Turkey, Taiwan, South Korea and the Philippines.

In Fiscal 1961, our aid to those countries totaled \$336 million, our dollar sales \$149 million. By Fiscal '68, our aid had dropped to \$141 million while dollar sales had climbed to more than half a billion.

True, these are but seven countries, and millions of the world's people still go to bed hungry, but breakthroughs have occurred in tropical agriculture the past few years that give real cause for hope that the progress of those seven can be emulated in the nations that still are floundering outside the mainstream of the world's economy.

(more)

This promising "revolution in tropical agriculture" has been inspired by American aid, both public and private, for the last 20 years, and it was triggered by the development of high-yielding strains of rice in the Philippines and high-yielding wheat in Mexico.

Most of you are familiar with the dramatic increases in the production of principal crops in the larger developing countries of Asia that are attributable to these new varieties, but I wonder if you are aware of the factors that set the stage for these gains.

At the instance of two great Presidents, we have taken some very specific steps in the Department of Agriculture, beginning in 1961 when we revived the lagging technical assistance program, convinced that world hunger could be conquered only by economic development in the hungry countries and that economic development depends on agricultural development.

The Food for Freedom Act of 1966 put into writing the self-help requirements of our food aid program, making specific self-help projects a requirement for such aid.

In 1966 we established the International Agricultural Development Service to work more closely with the Agency for International Development. That same year we signed an agreement with AID making more readily available the knowledge and skills of USDA specialists to help developing countries lay the ground-work for the long-term economic growth they must have if they are to feed themselves.

(more)

There now are 416 USDA specialists on overseas assignments under Participating Agency Service agreements with AID. In 1961, there were 40 technicians overseas.

We have been working with AID to get U. S. agribusiness increasingly involved in development overseas. Today, for example, two-thirds of all fertilizer plants being built in Asia, outside China and Japan, are being built by U. S. companies.

U. S. investments have been redirected to such basics as farm-to-market roads, irrigation projects, research, education -- the infrastructure of sound development.

And we have turned increasing attention to nutrition. We have recognized research evidence that a poor quality diet -- lack of proteins, vitamins -- can stunt the mind as well as the body.

USDA scientists are working with private companies -- some I am proud to say from Minnesota -- to develop high protein foods specially tailored to local eating habits for use both at home and abroad to put vital nutritive elements into the diets of those who do not now have enough of them.

A high protein bread is being sold in India; high protein soft drinks made of indigenous products are showing great promise in several countries.

(more)

We have, I think, in 8 years gained the initiative in the War on Hunger. We turned the corner when we accepted the fact that the developed countries must not try to feed the world, but must help the hungry countries feed themselves -- either by raising their own food or by buying what they need or both.

Our foreign food aid programs today are geared to this principle. We have a long way to go to end world hunger, but I am convinced that we are on the way.

Now I would like to turn in closing to what I believe to be one of the most significant new directions ever taken in the policy of the Department of Agriculture.

That is our growing recognition in the past 8 years of what I have called rural urban imbalance -- the anomaly of 70 percent of this Nation's people crowded onto less than 2 percent of the land and 30 percent rattling around on all the rest.

You know the history of the case: The technology that wrought the production miracle of American agriculture did so at a cost of 3 million farms. Farmers, farm hands and their families left the land for cities in search of jobs, and their departure eroded the economic base of small towns whose merchants had depended on their trade for a living.

As income fell in the towns, stores closed, tax bases shrank and communities were hard put to provide the services -- streets, education, health care -- so necessary to a viable community.

Too often, those leaving rural America are the best of the young, further sapping its strength, or those least qualified to compete for jobs in the city, adding to the already staggering problems of metropolitan governments.

It is clear to me that our impacted cities and our depopulated countryside are two faces of a single problem -- that of rural-urban imbalance.

And each must be attacked at the same time. There is no solution to the problems of the big city without rural revitalization to create opportunities for jobs, health care, education, and gracious living in the countryside to keep people there and attract others.

There has been, as you know, no national policy on people and land -- living space -- but we in the Department of Agriculture have become increasingly concerned about the decline in the countryside and have been working to redress the imbalance between people and land.

We have raised our sights to include Town as well as country America, and we have developed, through legislative and administrative action, a formidable array of programs designed to help local people in rural communities to get their area going again -- to move back into the mainstream of the American economy.

Basic to attracting business enterprises to a community and the expansion of those already there are the facilities they need to operate and to attract a work force -- such things as sewer and water, adequate housing, modern electric and telephone service, recreation facilities -- all the things that make for gracious living Americans increasingly demand.

(more)

We have done our utmost to put such facilities within reach of rural communities this past eight years. Our outlay for community water and sewer loans and grants went from \$2 million in Fiscal 1961 to \$186 million in Fiscal '69. Our outlay for rural housing loans and grants went up 7 times from \$70 million to \$494 million, and our rural electric and telephone loans went from \$325 million to \$470 million.

But there is more involved than hardware in revitalizing the countryside.

The entire concept will stand or fall on local participation and planning, and that means planning for the sound development of an entire area -- not just this town or that county unless we want to repeat the mistakes of big city America.

This principle of several counties joining together to plan for the development and wise use of the resources of each county for all the people of every county is embodied in our Resource Conservation and Development Projects authorized initially in the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, often called a charter for rural America.

There are today 51 of these projects embracing wide areas; none existed 8 years ago.

This same principle of cooperation -- of units of government working together to do things that none could do alone -- lies in the non-Metropolitan planning provisions of Section 701 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968.

(more)

I had the pleasure last week of joining with Secretary Wood of the Department of Housing and Urban Development in announcing the first grant under this Act. It went for comprehensive, multi-county planning assistance to four counties in Missouri.

This landmark legislation may well be to non-farm rural America what the Homestead Act of 1862 meant to our family farm structure. It will help and encourage townships, villages, counties within contiguous areas to form non-metropolitan districts, headed by a board or commission that is responsible for area planning, and, just as important, implementing such plans when developed.

This is a major breakthrough in the revitalization of rural America because it gets at one of the most pressing problems -- the need for improved government, effective planning and a sharing of services between local units of government.

It just doesn't make sense to expect a county of under 10,000 people -- and that means about one-fourth of this Nation's counties -- to provide the facilities and services needed to compete for industry and to attract and hold people.

The new district planning assistance program gives them the chance to pool their energy and their resources to do this.

I repeat: properly funded and properly used, this Act will do for non-farm rural America what the Homestead Act did for family farm agriculture -- open the door to new life and new opportunities.

(more)

I confidently stand behind this prediction, because I have seen in these 8 years a gathering momentum for revival in Countryside U. S. A. I have visited community after community where dynamic local people are using the machinery already in place -- private and public -- to restore opportunity and the chance for a better life to their particular corner of America.

And this machinery, pieced together over the years as we encountered new needs or discovered wrong directions on the road to rural revitalization, has worked.

The migration from country to city slowed by more than half from 1960 to 1965.

New jobs in the countryside are growing at double the rate of the 1950's.

The countryside's share of the Nation's non-farm job growth increased from 20 percent in 1962 to 27 percent in 1966.

Off farm income climbed from \$7.2 billion in 1960 to \$10.7 billion in 1967, almost 50 percent.

USDA Technical Action Panels and Outreach service are focusing funds and efforts of other departments and agencies of government increasingly on rural America.

(more)

Technical Action Panels in every county in the USA stand ready to coordinate government efforts and advise local people on development in every rural county.

The added thrust of the planning assistance provisions of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 will permit this momentum to be harnessed in a purposeful way toward the proper geographical distribution of opportunity in America and the chance for a life of quality for every American.

Town and Country has a crucial role in the destiny of America. Its agriculture anchors the domestic economy and offers hope to the hungry of the world. Its small towns, fields and hills offer clean air, sparkling water and living space to Americans, born and unborn, who want and deserve the chance to live and work where they choose, and to live in dignity.

I believe that rural America is prepared to meet that destiny. What is done in the next 10 years will determine how well.

So I can report to you tonight that I do not leave with regret. There is a measure of sadness, true ... but it is time to go. There is a limit to the span of one's effectiveness in a sensitive, controversial assignment. But I can assure you that as I move to my new work, seeking to apply the exciting new techniques of operations research, systems analyses and computer technology to solving modern social and economic problems in both the public and private sectors of our society, that I will do my level best to contribute to reaching the goals we share -- and that we have striven for together these past eight years.

287
sp.2

Testimony of the Honorable Orville L. Freeman
Secretary of Agriculture
before the
House Committee on Education and Labor
January 16, 1969

Last week I told the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Need that I was making my last appearance before a committee of the Congress as Secretary of Agriculture when I testified before them.

But here I am today testifying before this committee.

Apparently a Cabinet Officer -- to paraphrase the description of another type of public servant -- never dies, he just testifies away.

I shall always welcome the opportunity to testify on measures to end hunger and malnutrition, regardless of circumstances; and I welcome especially the opportunity to support the proposals -- H.R. 515 and H.R. 516 -- being considered today by this Committee. The latter would make available \$100 million a year for three years from Section 32 funds to provide free and reduced price meals to needy children, and the former would greatly strengthen the Federal-State framework through which the Child Nutrition Program operates.

Both of these bills are essential to maintain the momentum in the child nutrition programs achieved by the passage last session of H.R. 17872 and H.R. 17873 by the House. Both bills were recommendation of this Committee which I supported then as I do their counterparts today.

While the Senate, in its wisdom, did not enact those bills last session, the action of the House did lead to an additional \$50 million from the Appropriation Committee conferees -- \$5 million more for the regular School Lunch Program, and \$45 million to reach additional needy persons with special emphasis on needy children.

Because of this action, another 1.7 million school children who need free or reduced price breakfasts or lunches will be getting them for the first time this school year. Thus, where we had funds to provide this assistance to 2.5 million children, we now will be reaching over 4 million.

There are still another 2.5 million children who also need free or reduced price lunches or breakfasts, but who will not get them this school year. With the funding and authority provided in the bills under consideration by this Committee, we will continue to serve the children we are reaching today with better nutrition, and can reach those next year who are beyond our help today.

The breakthrough which the 1.7 million increase in children receiving free or reduced price lunches represents, began with the hearings before this Committee last May into the problems of hunger and malnutrition among America's poor.

I was privileged to testify at that time, and I would like to report now on the progress achieved since then, and recommendations to sustain this progress not only in the child nutrition programs, but also in the family assistance programs -- the food stamp and the commodity distribution programs.

Last May we were nearing the conclusion of a project to bring a food assistance program to each of the counties which ranks among the 1,000 with the lowest per capita income. Our target had been the more than 330 of these counties which did not have a food assistance program.

Recognizing that Congress had authorized the Food Stamp Program as a joint Federal-State effort -- and the Commodity Distribution Program had always been operated on this basis, I went to the Governors first, and then sent my people to talk with their State counterparts to enlist their support. We told them we would, if necessary, assist these counties to meet the administrative cost of the Commodity Distribution Program. Then, together, the USDA and State staffs went to local government boards, councils, and commissions to get their support and cooperation.

It was, and is, a hard, leather burning, often frustrating business; but it is the only way to make the Federal system do the job of serving people. And it doesn't always work perfectly. Of the 1,000 lowest income counties, after all the routes of State and local persuasion were exhausted, and over 180 counties had accepted the offer of help, I was left with no option but to operate a commodity program directly in 49 counties. Otherwise, the poor in these counties would not get the food assistance they clearly need.

We are now left with about 480 counties and independent cities where no food assistance program is available. Many of these are among our wealthiest counties, and most of them lie in the plains and mountain

States of the Middle West. The question now is how do we get them into the program. I have been working for the past several months on a plan to bring a food assistance program into all the remaining areas. So long as one person is hungry and cannot afford the food he and his family needs, then all of us -- singly and together -- share a responsibility for his welfare.

In developing a plan to give complete coverage to the family food program, I have been reluctant to supplant local authority. I also have felt it is hardly appropriate to reward those who have denied assistance to the poor by offering to pay the administrative cost of operating the commodity program. If we do that for the more wealthy counties not in the program, the likely reaction of the other counties which have been willing to pay the cost of administration will be to demand similar treatment.

Considering all of these restraints, I have under consideration a plan to share local administrative costs with all counties -- or with States where these programs are operated by the State -- on an equitable basis. It calls for a sliding scale that will provide a range of payments -- 20 percent to over 90 percent -- depending on the number of persons in households with poverty incomes and the per capita income rank of the county.

To be eligible for this assistance, each county will have to submit a proposed plan of operation, detailing such facts as the number of commodities to be distributed, the number of distribution centers to be established, special distribution plans -- such as truck delivery for the elderly and

disabled, and special procedures for certifying eligible families and individuals.

Such a cost-sharing plan would, we think, help to reach the localities not yet in the program and provide uniform guidelines to strengthen the program all over the country. It will go far to assure that low income families in this program will receive all of the 22 commodities we now offer -- and which can provide an adequate diet in nearly all respects.

We have been equally vigorous in efforts to improve the Food Stamp Program. We have in the past two years (1) reduced the price of stamps for the very poor from \$2 a month per person to 50 cents, with a family maximum of \$3, (2) reduced the cost the first month for a new family by half, and (3) instituted over 20 other administrative reforms -- ranging from a new certification procedure for families with seasonal income to allowing States to deliver stamps by mail without being held liable for loss.

Last month I announced another large-scale revision in the purchase requirements and bonus levels for Food Stamps. Essentially, the action lowered the cost of stamps for families with incomes of \$70 or less a month, and increased the bonus amount to provide a greater level of food purchasing power than before. About 500,000 persons will benefit directly from these improvements which become effective in February and March.

The reduction in the purchase price reflects only part of a planned revision I had to cancel at the last moment after the Congress appropriated only \$280 million this fiscal year of a \$315 million authorization. I was prepared to carry out a broad revision of the food stamp purchase schedule in every income category. These revisions were based on a special task force survey which was begun by the Department almost 8 months ago. The task force, reviewing a number of previous studies -- including the just completed 1965 food consumption survey, concluded that low income families will spend less for food than we had assumed if their food expenditure pattern is considered over an extended time period. We are presently conducting additional studies to define these patterns more precisely. Our review, together with our program experience, indicated that month after month most of the poor would be able to allocate about 24 to 33 percent of their income for food, depending on family size.

We were prepared to reduce the purchase requirements had the Congress appropriated as much as it authorized.

In the future, the Food Stamp Program should be extended to all areas, replacing the Commodity Distribution Program. The cost of stamps should be reduced and the bonus levels should be increased to provide a food allowance fully adequate to meet the nutritional needs of those who are eligible. All it will take to do this are appropriations by the Congress.

In addition, a number of legislative modifications should be made to further strengthen program administration. These include the establishment of national eligibility standards based on income, and provision of authority for the Secretary to operate programs directly

if local authority refuses or fails to meet decent standards of administration.

In addition, a number of legislative modifications should be made to further strengthen program administration. These include the establishment of national eligibility standards based on income, and provision of authority for the Secretary to operate programs directly if local authority refuses or fails to meet decent standards of administration.

Before concluding my discussion of the Food Stamp Program, I wish to clarify one point which I believe has caused a great deal of misunderstanding. The legislative intent of the Congress in establishing this program was not to create a general relief program but -- as specifically and clearly stated in Section 7 of the Act -- a program to put food in peoples' bellies. So that money regularly spent on food would not be used for other purposes -- even such basic essentials as medicine or shoes -- the Congress specifically required that those who participate in the program must pay in what is determined they normally spend for food to receive bonus stamps. Until the Congress changes or modifies that requirement, any President or Secretary of Agriculture must by law require cash payment for bonus stamps.

Last May I also reported we were reaching about 2.5 million children with free or reduced price lunches through the School Lunch Program, but we estimated that from 6 to 7 million children should be receiving them.

The measure you enacted to correct this gap, as I have said, did not become law; but to the everlasting credit of this Committee and its distinguished Chairman, your efforts did bring forth \$45 million more to give better nutrition to children who most need it.

In the light of the legislative history and the clear intent of Congress, we allocated the funds as follows:

***** \$43 million has been apportioned to the States for use in reaching needy children through school food service. Rather than telling the States that they could use a specified amount for free or reduced price lunches and a specified amount for the breakfast program and a specified amount for equipment, we apportioned the funds in line with the formula your legislation contained, and asked the States to advise us of their plans for the use of this money.

State and local needs vary greatly. A number of States, particularly in the Southeast, have long since provided their schools with the equipment and facilities for food service. The great need there might well be for funds to increase the number of free or reduced price meals at noon or to begin or expand a breakfast program. Major urban areas, however, often provide little or no food service in the downtown elementary schools. They have no equipment and no place to put it. By adding a few pieces of basic equipment in a secondary school, they could provide food service to satellite neighborhood schools. In this kind of situation, the schools need a package -- some equipment, some transport service plus funds to help underwrite the meal cost for those youngsters who can't pay the going rate.

This money -- this \$43 million -- will bring in some 1.7 million children for whom a meal at school otherwise would have been too expensive.

Our reports are starting to roll in from the States and from the cities, and they indicate an excellent start:

In Providence, Rhode Island, 49 schools are receiving extra assistance and the number of free and reduced price lunches is up by 1,000 a day. In Philadelphia, six inner-city schools have come into the program because of this money and they are serving around 2,000 lunches a day. In Wilmington, Delaware, three schools are now serving 600 additional free lunches a day. Gary, Indiana, expects to get a food service program into every school through the use of these funds.

In Portland, Oregon, 22 schools are serving free lunches to an additional 2,400 children a day. In Wichita, Kansas, some 4,600 children in 11 schools with no food service will be offered lunch for the first time.

Kentucky intends to provide free or reduced price lunches to 60,000 additional pupils enrolled in National School Lunch Program schools plus breakfast for 20,000 children in 250 schools. Detroit plans call for providing a food service to 70 schools in the target area presently without such service. In New Orleans, the lunch charges in a number of needy schools have been reduced from 20 cents to 10 cents, involving some 16,000 children from low-income families. In Cleveland, 25 breakfast programs are to be opened and plans call for opening a centralized kitchen operation to serve 18 inner-city schools with an estimated participation of 7,000 children.

We are using \$1 million of the \$45 million to strengthen State administration of school food service. Support for this need is long overdue. It was authorized under the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 but the first penny had never been appropriated. It takes time, expert advice and technical assistance -- and administrative funds -- to move rapidly to bring school food service to the hard core poor schools. We allocated a basic grant to each State which requested it, and said that additional funding would be based on a plan justifying the need for additional help.

The final \$1 million is being used to bring a supplementary food package to new and expectant mothers and very young children in food stamp areas. We are using Section 32 authority and funds to do this job in areas with the Commodity Donation Program. The supplementary package includes such foods as evaporated milk and corn syrup for an infant formula plus an iron-enriched instant cereal and certain additional protein items for the mother. The program was developed in response to concern about the more nutritionally vulnerable groups in the low-income population -- groups we often cannot reach through child nutrition or family assistance programs. We operate the supplemental food assistance in cooperation with health officials in OEO and HEW through health clinics, hospitals and medical centers serving the poor. We provide the food, and medical personnel at the clinic determine which of the items is needed by the woman and her young children. There are now 60 programs in operation, and the number is growing rapidly.

While I have stressed thus far the importance of funding, I am also very much aware that success in the child nutrition programs also

rests on a strong cooperative effort among Federal, State, and local government -- in this case the local school districts.

We also have been concentrating on these problems. We are finding workable solutions to strengthen our joint operations. Last year, acting on the recommendations of a Federal-State school lunch workshop sponsored by the Department, I issued new regulations requiring each State to develop guidelines and each school district and child care institution (1) to develop and publish policy statements for determining the eligibility of children for free and reduced price lunches, and (2) to develop procedures to insure that children who receive this assistance are not singled out or subjected to ridicule.

All States have now published these guidelines, and I anticipate that by early February most school districts also will have criteria prepared and published. In this way, everyone will know the rules by which the money Congress appropriates will be used to help feed hungry children.

I also am publishing an amendment to the school lunch regulations which will enable school districts where large numbers of schools do not now provide lunch or meal service to experiment with the use of food management companies to provide food service. Currently, about 9.5 million children attend schools where meal service is not available. Most of these schools either are in the inner city, the ghetto communities, or in remote rural districts. They lack space for lunch room facilities, and generally serve a group of children who are most likely to benefit from the lunch program. More than a million will be eligible for free or reduced price lunches.

The problems of reaching the inner city schools have received a great deal of attention within the Department in recent years. Two years ago we launched "Operation Metropolitan", a program designed to focus additional manpower and technical resources on the inner city school systems. It has produced some notable successes, but it is a long-range answer to an immediate and pressing need.

Last summer, once we knew that we would in all likelihood have more money for child nutrition programs, I directed that an approach be developed to see if we could "leap-frog" the time consuming and expensive procedure of equipping inner-city schools with extensive kitchen and service equipment.

During this past summer and fall, working first with State officials and then with representatives of food management companies, we developed a series of prototype contracts which school districts could use to employ the food service capabilities of the commercial food management firms.

The first and major consideration was the type of contract that would keep the management and administrative responsibilities firmly in the hands of the professional school lunch supervisor. But I want to see if the job of preparing, transporting and serving meals can be contracted out. If the availability of meals -- the key roadblock to food service in these hard-to-reach schools -- can be overcome with the help of commercial firms, then we can reach our goal in a shorter period of time.

Our present plans are to line up about half a dozen school districts in urban areas to participate in this experimental approach. I know there has been considerable criticism of this proposal on the part of the professional school food service people, but I believe we will be able to demonstrate that this experiment will prove out to be one more tool for reaching more children. We will be operating in a fishbowl -- as always -- and I know the skeptics will be watching every move. I welcome their scrutiny because they are dedicated professionals concerned as we are with the welfare of children and maintaining the integrity of food service programs for children.

Considering the gap which remains between the good intentions we express and our ability to carry them out, I do not believe any approach should be excluded arbitrarily. In cooperation with the Department of Housing and Urban Development, we are launching comprehensive community food programs in 5 model city projects, with special emphasis on child nutrition programs. We are encouraging more school districts to experiment with pre-packaged meals which can be served quickly with minimum investment in kitchen equipment. I would also like to see experiments tried with publicly owned inter-district food service units where one central facility would handle food purchasing and preparation and delivery services for all schools and child care activities in several districts. I believe real economies of scale can be achieved in the purchasing, preparation and delivery of meals even as school food service is improved.

Early last year I also requested the USDA-Land Grant College Joint Committee to develop a research and training program for school food service personnel at Federal, State, and local levels. I now have their report and I am taking steps to carry it out.

Briefly, the Committee recommends regional seminars to provide continuing education for State and local food service professionals; regional centers for graduate training to increase professional competence in nutrition education and the several aspects of program administration; more research in food service programs; development of an associate degree program in Junior and Community colleges; and establishment of an Educational Materials Center in the Department of Agriculture for instructional materials in training food service personnel.

This program will provide the foundation for continual improvement in the professional capability of those working in the child nutrition programs.

Based on the greater availability of funds to reach needy children, I have also revised our school lunch regulations to offer schools with high concentrations of needy children a choice of two options that will increase the amount of funds they may receive to help feed these children.

As you can see, we have been busy -- we have moved -- we felt we reached a break-through point last year and we used it to establish momentum.

We need H.R. 515. We need it if we are to carry out the recommendations I mentioned above for training of food service personnel and out-reach in nutrition education.

We need the revised matching formula to bring State tax dollars into the school food service programs. If there is to be a sound basis for program expansion, the States -- all of them -- should assume some share of the financing. A few States now make such an in-put, but most do not. They rely instead on meeting the matching requirements through children's payments for the lunch. I believe the gradual scale of increasing State funding which this bill requires, is a sound and equitable one.

I recognize also that the requirement in the bill for each State and school district to publish eligibility standards for free and reduced price lunches has been set out in program regulations. Some may say this provision is not needed. I would welcome it, however, as an indication the Congress is as intent as the USDA to feed the hungry child.

If this bill -- H.R. 515 -- is enacted, I believe this Congress can say in good conscience, the legislative framework to reach children with improved nutrition is complete.

With reference to the second measure, H.R. 516, the kind of money that bill carries is essential to the goal we have set in the child nutrition programs. If we don't get it, not only are we going to disappoint the 2.5 million children we still need to reach with a free or reduced price meal, but also we will take away the meals from the 1.7 million children added to the program this year. State and local governments have moved

rapidly and in good faith to use the additional \$43 million. Failure to continue and expand the program can only result in greater reluctance of the States to give their support to the goal of reaching every child with a lunch or breakfast -- to say nothing of the cynicism which will be generated if States are asked to contribute funds to programs Congress will not support.

In the time remaining, I would like to review with you the President's budget for 1970. It carries requests totaling \$406.5 million for feeding children. This will all be in the form of cash grants with the exception of \$64.3 million for the purchase of foods to help schools meet the nutritional requirements of the Type A lunch and \$3.8 million for Federal administration for these programs. In addition, we expect to make available almost \$240 million in donated foods to schools and other eligible child food service programs.

Some of the funding for these programs will be from direct appropriations -- some from Section 32. We are, for example, requesting a continuation of the \$50 million from Section 32 that was carried as an amendment to the Department's appropriation bill last year.

I would like to outline for you a comparison of the budget requests for fiscal year 1970 with the funds allocated for this fiscal year for child food service programs. For the regular school lunch program -- \$168,041,000 in 1970 compared with \$162,041,000 this year; special assistance for lunches served in low-income area schools -- \$111,000,000 in fiscal 1970

compared with \$43,600,000 this year; school breakfast program -- \$11,000,000 in fiscal 1970 compared with \$6,500,000 in fiscal 1969; equipment assistance for low-income area schools -- \$15,000,000 in 1970 compared with \$7,150,000 this year; assistance to day-care centers and other non-school activities under the Vanik bill enacted last year -- \$20,500,000 in 1970 compared with \$5,750,000 this year; grants to strengthen State administration in all the child feeding programs -- \$2,800,000 in fiscal 1970 compared with \$1,750,000 this year.

The budget proposal will provide sufficient funding to provide free or reduced price lunches to all children who need them, as we can best estimate those needs at this time. It also proposes to make full use of the Section 32 funds which will be newly obligated under the 1970 budget.

Thus, some may argue that the budget as proposed will accomplish all that is intended in H.R. 516. I believe, however, that both are necessary. The States, if they are to embark on a program at the level proposed in the 1970 budget, need the assurance that the program will continue for more than a year. The families whose children will receive a better diet also need the assurance that the program, once begun, will continue.

H.R. 516 will provide that assurance. If the appropriations are adequate to meet the goal we have set out, then the Secretary will have no need to call on the authority proposed in this legislation. If they are not, then the funding will be available to meet the need which is clearly there.

I also recognize that some will protest that obligating Section 32 funds in this manner will diminish their availability in case of emergency situations which could develop in some commodity areas. I see no problem in this regard. Rather, with the expansion of the School Lunch program and the Commodity Distribution program, we have a substantially expanded market for food commodities, and will be able to handle any emergency situation with greater ease today than in earlier years.

Finally, I would like to address myself to a question which my distinguished Cabinet colleague in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare has raised about the food assistance program. Secretary Cohen has proposed that these programs should be removed from the USDA and placed in a new agency within HEW. I have not had the opportunity to discuss this proposal with Secretary Cohen, but I feel I should place my view on the record. I can do it now in this fashion since I have no longer a personal stake in the matter.

The major objective we have pursued is to insure the food assistance programs reach those who need this help. Over the past eight years, we have developed this capacity at the Federal level -- and we have identified the key roadblocks which exist at the State and local level, and have developed the techniques which are being successfully applied to overcome them.

In the process, we have come to realize the essential character of the supporting services within the USDA, but not available directly in the Consumer Food Program area. We rely on other divisions and other

agencies to forecast supply conditions, to handle all the myriad details of purchasing, to establish standards and insure they are met -- in effect, the development of an effective Federal program rests on a complex system; as complex as the food marketing system itself.

Further, as we have progressed in the delivery system, we also have become aware of the need to provide more knowledge about food and nutrition, and the need to create individual incentive to obtain better diets. In fact, the delivery of the food may well be the easiest part of eliminating hunger and malnutrition. The hardest part will be to develop an effective program of nutrition education. We have now begun this effort through the Cooperative Federal-State Extension Service. Programs are underway now in 48 of the 50 States, and action will soon be underway in the remaining two States. Nutrition education must be closely coordinated with the food assistance programs, and both must be guided by the same hand.

I find no evidence to suggest the food assistance programs would be administered any better, or as well, within another Department. Rather, it is my judgment that they cannot be operated as well should they lose the built in capacities which exist only within the USDA.

This concludes my testimony. I would like to take this opportunity to thank this Committee, and particularly you, Mr. Chairman, for all the support you have extended to us in helping to develop the Child Nutrition Program as a unique expression of the public's will that the hungry child will be served.

I will be happy to respond to any questions you may have.

U. S. DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE
NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY

FEB 11 1969

CURRENT SERIAL RECORDS

